DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 427 353 CS 509 985

AUTHOR Cecil, Donald; Koester, Susan H.
TITLE Reversing a Century's Damage: Undoing Harvard's Legacy of Separate Courses for Freshman Speaking and Writing.
PUB DATE 1998-11-00
NOTE 46p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association (84th, New York, NY, November 21-24, 1998).
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Course Descriptions; *Freshman Composition; Higher Education; *Instructional Innovation; Integrated Curriculum; Learning Strategies; Public Speaking; Rhetoric; *Speech Instruction; Teaching Methods; *Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS *Speaking Writing Relationship; University of Alaska Southeast

ABSTRACT

This paper asserts that by removing speech and rhetoric from the "English" department and making composition a stepchild of literature, Harvard and Johns Hopkins Universities ultimately made it much more difficult for writing instructors today to capitalize on the strong physical underpinnings that speech and rhetoric provide to writing. Writing students gain much of their knowledge about writing in speech class, largely through their ears rather than solely through their eyes and intellect. The problem of student writers being removed from a significant audience could be substantially reduced if introductory speaking and writing courses were combined. At a University of Alaska campus, a two-year pilot course was developed which melded first semester freshman writing with the basic oral communication course. This evolved into a nine-credit year-long communication block with the freshman writing course integrated with the first half of the speech class during fall semester and the second writing course integrated with the remainder of the interpersonal/small group communication/public speaking course during the spring semester. Both have met with success. (Contains 26 references; appendixes contain a memorandum describing the course, a course syllabus, 2 course outlines, and a sample student information sheet.) (CR)

Reversing a Century's Damage: Undoing Harvard's Legacy of Separate Courses for Freshman Speaking and Writing

Donald Cecil
Associate Professor of Communications
University of Alaska Southeast
11120 Glacier Highway
Juneau, Alaska (AK) 99801
(907) 465-5387
don.cecil@UAS.alaska.edu

Susan H. Koester
Professor of Communications
University of Alaska Southeast
11120 Glacier Highway
Juneau, Alaska (AK) 99801
(907) 465-6422
susan.koester@UAS.alaska.edu

Prepared for the Annual Convention of the
National Communication Association
New York City
November 20-24, 1998

Reversing a Century's Damage: Undoing Harvard's Legacy of Separate Courses for Freshman Speaking and Writing

THE PROBLEM

Every man takes the limits of his own field of vision for the limits of the world.
-- Schopenhauer

Education, I fear, is learning to see one thing by going blind to another.
-- Aldo Leopold

Writing and speaking are inherently similar: stringing words together to express thoughts. It has never made sense to us—the authors—to teach college students how to write and how to communicate orally in separate introductory courses that are taught by totally separate departments. Yet that is the situation at most colleges and universities, and has been for decades. James J. Murphy, professor emeritus in the Departments of Rhetoric and English at the University of California, Davis, reminds us that a century ago this state of affairs was hardly universal:

> At Princeton I taught a class called composition, a mixed speech/writing class offered by the English Department. It was modeled on the nineteenth-century Cornell system where speaking and writing were taught at the same time as interrelated activities. As you may know, for a while Ivy League schools pursued that plan rather than having separate courses. Around the turn of the century, schools like Cornell, Dartmouth, Brown, Princeton—not Harvard—had these courses where every aspect of language use was taught. The different aspects weren't regarded as separate activities. (qtd. in Creek 12)

Asked why this tradition of teaching speech and writing together in the same course had ended, Murphy replied:

> In the 1880s Harvard's English Department began to redefine the nature of English studies to emphasize literary-critical scholarship at the expense of rhetoric. They threw rhetoric out of the department and reduced composition to a second-class status. This is when the classical curriculum began to crumble. Then in 1917 the oral teachers walked out of the NCTE [National Council of Teachers of English] and formed what is now called the Speech Communication Association.[1] (qtd. in Creek 12-13)

What led to such a drastic parting between rhetoric and literary studies? In his Tradition and Reform in the Teaching of English: A History, Arthur N. Applebee notes that prior to these changes, American colleges offered rhetoric courses that stemmed "from the long tradition of popular, nonacademic criticism, and from oratory . . . [and] which placed more emphasis on sensitive reading and 'interpretation'" rather than on the rigorous analysis of texts (28). But in the latter part of the nineteenth century, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, and other influential east coast schools began to emphasize philology—classical literary scholarship—at the expense of rhetoric (25). What philology offered was a "scientific study of language [and literature], a methodology equal in rigor and academic respect to any of the classical studies" (25). According to Applebee,

> Before philological studies began to dominate, the professor of English was a curiously ambiguous entity. . . . [I]n many institutions he was simply a clergyman whose oratorical skills gave him license to lecture on language and rhetoric. . . . There

[1] renamed the National Communication Associatiion in 1996.

> were no producing scholars in the modern languages, no periodicals, and no university presses. Between 1850 and 1900, however, this changed completely, with philological scholarship transforming the study of modern languages. . . . (26)

Therefore, "the ideals of specialization, of productive scholarship, and of scientific study of the modern languages were pursued [at Harvard and elsewhere] along philological lines" (27) and quickly spread across American colleges and universities. The resulting curriculum was weighted heavily toward the cerebral and biased against the more physical and bodily aspects found in rhetoric's traditional offerings—a bias which contributed heavily to the decision to exclude rhetoric from these newly created "English" departments.

As with most academic paradigm shifts of this magnitude, there was a very serious tradeoff: the elevation of rigorous, systematic scholarship at the expense of the body's usefulness to learning.[2] Alfred North Whitehead states the problem succinctly: "I lay it down as an educational axiom that in teaching you will come to grief as soon as you forget that your pupils have bodies" (qtd. in Ochsner 26). Most college speech and writing instructors teach in a field that depends on their students "getting physical" with the subject, which is exactly what rhetoric instructors had their students doing a century ago when writing and speaking, as James Murphy said, "weren't regarded as separate activities." Today, teacher-researchers know that the more students get physical with the subject, the better the chances they will make it part of their blood and bones, whether the material be poetry, drama, writing, or

[2] This is not surprising, according to English professor Davis Dunbar McElroy, who reminds us that "When the intellect is put in charge, it is not content merely to be supreme, it wants to exclude everything else [of value—the body, emotions, etc.]. Given the chance, it will suppress everything that is not itself, and it will suppress it absolutely if it can" (McElroy, n. pag.).

public speaking. Harvard's English department, unwittingly or otherwise, underscored this unfortunate segregation of body and intellect by reinforcing the strong prejudices our academic culture holds against the active use of the body in the classroom. In his book Physical Eloquence and the Biology of Writing, Robert Ochsner writes, "education is, or at least it should involve, a physical and intellectual balance" (26), adding that "only by recognizing, as Whitehead warned, that students have bodies, can teachers of writing succeed in preparing their students to write well" (3). By removing speech and rhetoric from "the English department" and making composition a stepchild of literature, Harvard and Johns Hopkins Universities ultimately made it much more difficult for writing instructors today to capitalize on the strong physical underpinnings that speech and rhetoric provide to writing.

A BRIEF RATIONALE FOR COMBINING THE TWO DISCIPLINES

> The connectedness of things is what the educator contemplates to the limit of his capacity.
>
> - - Mark Van Doren

We believe the connections between speaking and writing are far too powerful to be overlooked. Elementary language arts teachers have long been aware of the power of the ear to link speaking and writing together. Indeed, whole-language practitioners always talk about the ear's intimate relationship with all the language arts. In particular,

> Speech has important ramifications on writing development, as it touches on many different areas of the writing process. Since children already have background knowledge of spoken

> language when they come to school, this schema can be used to make learning complex written language easier. (Solchenberger 1)[3]

College students also bring an extensive background knowledge of spoken language to school and so ought to make use of the same advantages that speech confers on younger writers. New York University English education professor John Mayher reminds us why this is so: "While there are differences among pupils at different ages," he says, "the processes of language development . . . are essentially the same from kindergarten throughout the rest of schooling, indeed from birth to death" (18). Therefore, if everyone learns language throughout life in the same basic ways, and if "getting physical" with the written language through speaking and performing one's writing is the most natural way for children to learn to write, then it makes sense that our own students will learn to manipulate written language with more sophistication if they spend time performing it in order to receive as much aural feedback as possible. As Robert Ochsner reminds us, the ear is just as important to the biology of writing as the eye and the brain (2).

Writing expert Peter Elbow gives us one reason why the ear is so effective in teaching students to write:

> The best writing has <u>voice</u>: the life and rhythms of speech. Unless we actively train our students to <u>speak onto paper</u>, they will write the kind of dead, limp, nominalized prose we hate—or <u>say</u> we hate. We see the difference most clearly in extreme cases: experienced teachers learn that when they get a student who writes prose that is so tied in knots that it is impenetrable

[3] Solchenberger relies on information from D.L. Rubin and K. J. Kantor's "Talking and Writing: Building Communication Competence." In <u>The Talking and Writing Series, K-12: Successful Classroom Practices</u> (p. 53). Ed. C.M. Johnson and A. H. App. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education (ERIC Accession No. ED 233 386).

> they need only to ask the student to say what she was getting at and the student will almost invariably speak the thought in syntax which is perfectly clear and lively. . . . If the student had known enough to "speak the thought onto paper" and then simply cleaned up the syntax, the writing would have been much better than her best "essay writing." (292)

Another reason for the ear's effectiveness is that listening does more than almost anything else to sharpen a student's sense of audience. For example, writers reading their papers out loud to themselves don't receive nearly as much feedback as when they read those papers out loud to a live audience, or have other students read what they've written back to them. Years ago, when Don volunteered as a Saturday-morning newscaster at a small-town public radio station, he watched a number of high-school news reporters at the station teach themselves how to write through performance. After writing and recording their stories and splicing in their sound bites, these apprentices would play back these stories to anyone who would listen and give editorial help. They would then rewrite and re-record their pieces and patch together a "final" product. But it was not until these kids "went public" with their work—i.e., actually heard their stories being broadcast—that they became hyper-aware of the effect their words were having on their audience. Frequently dissatisfied with what they heard, these young reporters would often pull their stories and rework them for a later newscast. Hearing their words aired helped them locate the gaping holes that listeners could fall into and then find the words to fill in those holes.

What was true for those kids was true as well for some of Don's freshman writing students, who were enrolled in both his speech and writing courses ten years back (as opposed to being enrolled in just one course or the

other) at the University of Alaska's small campus in Sitka. About midway through the semester, he began to notice an extraordinary thing: the students who enrolled in both courses seemed to be learning far more about writing than those who were taking just the writing class. For example, when he would talk about transitions, students taking both speech and writing grabbed hold of this concept faster because they had been performing their writing extensively in front of others in their speech course and therefore had physically experienced the need to supply their listeners with transitions that integrated one idea with another and connected one sentence to the next. Don soon realized he had gained a solid teaching advantage with these students. Now when he talked to them in freshman composition about the transitions that were missing in their writing, these students could grasp the problem much faster. He could say to them, "Remember when you gave speech X and your listeners seemed to lose your thread? And remember when you re-gave the speech and didn't have this problem because you had clearly marked your turning points with transitions?" Indeed, they did remember. They could feel his point and therefore knew immediately what to do to fix the problem in their writing. His students learned these concepts by performing their writing before a live audience in the speech course and observing just how their listeners were receiving their words.

In short, these writing students were gaining much of their knowledge about writing in his speech class—not just his writing course—and were gaining their knowledge largely through their ears, a physical, gut-level knowledge that evidently was far more immediate and useful to them than knowledge gained solely through their eyes and intellect. Robert Ochsner explains why this is so in his book Physical Eloquence and the Biology of Writing:

> . . . most [writing] students have quite normally and subconsciously acquired the values of expressing themselves through speech. The act of writing forces students to suppress these values as it takes away the immediate satisfaction of an audience and physically removes the writer from the social community in which speech takes shape. (Ochsner 130)

The problem of student writers being removed from a significant audience could be substantially reduced if we were to combine our introductory speaking and writing courses. If Don's students could learn to write more effectively through performing their work in front of others, and if average high-school students could empower themselves by doing the same thing at a local radio station, then colleges and universities could certainly capitalize on the power that performance confers upon freshman writing and speaking students—the heightened ability to discover exactly what an audience needs—by dissolving the boundaries between the departments of writing and speech and combining and integrating their required freshman courses.

STEPS TOWARD "GETTING OUT OF THE BOX" AND COMBINING OUR INTRODUCTORY SPEAKING AND WRITING COURSES

On the Juneau campus, the notion of combining speaking and writing began with a friendship between two women: one a professor of English, and the other a professor of speech communication. Though trained in different disciplines, Drs. Joey Wauters and Susan Koester shared similar lifestyles, pedagogical approaches to instruction, community college teaching backgrounds, and the university's goal of increasing student communication competencies. As a result of their compatibility and, to be honest, their desire to minimize their administrative workload since the two women defined

themselves primarily as teachers, they decided, in the early eighties, to co-chair the communications department. Joey took responsibility for coordinating English offerings, and Sue for speech communication courses. With five full-time English faculty, one full-time speech person and the remaining instructors part-time adjunct faculty, the bond between the two disparate disciplines was forged relatively easily.

Responding to nascent demands for student assessment, the English faculty, under Joey's direction, began an ambitious writing-across-the-curriculum program to train faculty from other disciplines in the instruction of writing. Many UAS faculty, including speech instructor Sue, took advantage of these professional-development opportunities (led by national composition experts such as Dr. Ed White and local talent such as Ms. Gail Parsons) as well as training offered by the statewide writing consortium. As the only full-time speech instructor at the time, Sue discovered that their methods for instructing and assessing student writing were remarkably similar to those she employed in her oral communication classes; thus, with relative ease, she adapted these "new" old tools to her classes. Within a short period of time, however, she found that despite her twenty-plus years of teaching and these valuable "writing across the curriculum" workshops, her speech students required more direction and feedback about their writing from her at the same time she required better writing from them. Increasingly she found herself turning to her colleagues on the English side of her department for their assistance; thus, the nexus of a team-taught communication course slowly emerged.

As mentioned earlier, Don's interest in the speaking/writing process began ten years ago with his teaching experience at UAS's small branch campus in Sitka where he found that composition students who were

enrolled in both his speech and writing classes were learning far more about writing than those who were enrolled in only his writing course. In 1988 Don joined the Juneau faculty primed to discuss his experiences. As both Sue and Don individually began to see the natural links between these subjects, they considered creating a linked speaking/writing option (much like Don's two courses in Sitka, similar to those with which other disciplines were experimenting on the Juneau campus).

Given Sue's need for more expertise in writing instruction and her desire to team teach an interdisciplinary communications class, and given Don's desire to get back to teaching oral communication after transferring to UAS's main campus in Juneau, their tentative conversations led to the development of a two-year pilot course which melded first-semester freshman writing with the basic oral communication course. Encouraged by the graduate work of English Adjunct Karleen Grummett, who used the course as a case study in her research, we sought and found further support from the English chair and our academic dean for a semester-length, team-taught speaking/writing course to begin in the fall of 1995.

It was apparent at the conclusion of this two-year pilot that many of our students appreciated the connections we were making between writing and speaking. Some months after the first semester, one young woman continued using the class's email conference and wrote, "I often come to this conference to see what's still happening in this class. Some classes die harder than others and this seems to be one of them." In rejoinder, a classmate responded,

> Yep. I definitely agree. . . . I loved that class and I would have enjoyed taking it every semester if it were offered. It just made me feel good to do something personal (speeches) and

something a little formal (writing) at the same time, and get the same sort of excitement from both.

These thoughts were echoed by the case study comments of two students that Karleen tracked. She noted how the speaking-writing connections made by these students helped them build bridges between oral and written communication and learn the process of shifting from one to the other. One of our learners, Greg, believed that essay writing clearly helped him with his speeches. "Writing the essay forced me to do more research and really know my subject," he wrote. After winning a statewide freshman composition contest, Greg remarked to Sue that it was the process of first writing his "Broken English, Broken Faces, Broken Dreams" essay, then reading his first draft aloud in class to his peer editors, followed by revising it for a speech, and finally completing it for a final submission that resulted in his success. Other students, commenting on this experience, noted how it allowed them to know their subject better and helped them with structure. Furthermore, the recursive nature of writing into speaking and speaking into writing helped them with composing an essay, then presenting a speech, and then revising the essay; thus using each mode of discourse helped to generate ideas for the other mode.

Some of our learners conveyed in their feedback to us that they could now see holes in their content and grammar, were able to write clearer essays by using examples from their speeches, and found giving speeches after writing a draft an effective tool for later revising their essays. These reflections on the process confirmed in our minds the value of our joint departmental effort and the value of helping students move back and forth from speaking to writing. As Karleen concluded, "The general recursive theme of these responses . . . indicates the effectiveness of writing speeches

and essays about the same subject. Reading them aloud can only reinforce the important connections between speaking and writing" (Grummett 25).

Don and Sue agreed that this early interdisciplinary pilot course validated the similarities between speaking and writing and reinforced in their minds the need for connecting our two disciplines in innovative ways: certainly this course offered one good option. But despite these successes we also discovered that our students' oral communication competence and confidence had not increased measurably in this one-semester interdisciplinary class as demonstrated by their Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-15) scores and more importantly by their group work and oral presentations. One semester apparently was not enough time to develop the speaking/listening competencies to the level that the university's assessment standards demanded. Furthermore, melding the two required general education classes did little to enhance student speaking skills in the second of two writing classes that all UAS students must take. Thus after two years of experimenting with this initial model we again approached the dean and departmental chair with the proposal for a more inclusive year-long communication block combining all of UAS's required communication courses—SpC 111: Fundamentals of Oral Communication; Engl. 111: Freshman Composition; and Engl. 211: Intermediate Composition with Modes of Literature.

Rather than continue to offer the combined freshman writing and speaking course for a six credit, one-semester option, we now envisioned a nine-credit, year-long communication block with the freshman writing course integrated with the first half of the speech class during fall semester, and with spring semester integrating the second writing course with the remainder of our interpersonal/small-group communication/public

speaking course. The anticipated advantage of a full year block was to provide students with more time to strengthen their oral communication competencies. Despite the registration and potential transferability obstacles, we convinced the administration (see attached proposal to registrar) of the viability of such an undertaking. This new experiment began a year ago with a team of two English faculty and one speech communication professor. We are repeating the block this year; the previous year's English faculty serve as consultants to the project, but a new writing instructor has joined Sue for this academic year.

As we look back on the first year of this new undertaking, one might reasonably ask, "Why would a teacher take on the time-consuming responsibility of team teaching without a commensurate increase in salary?" And: "Why would a speech or writing instructor risk diluting or, worse yet, risk losing their 'bread-and-butter' courses?" A number of explanations are possible. Some instructors view this interdisciplinary experience as a professional-development opportunity to learn more about both the teaching pedagogy as well as the content of a different discipline. Take, for example, researcher Karleen's reaction, which she explained as validating "the directions I had begun taking in my own classes" and which suggested for her "many techniques and methods to use in future ones." As she explained:

> I had no idea that so many things would happen on so many levels--my ongoing, continual, internal and external comparisons--between the class I observed and my own class, whether through instruction or techniques, and between observing the similarities and differences--the interconnectedness--of speech and writing approaches. I began to notice this interconnectedness in a refreshing way, through instructors looking at speech

> as interconnected and from a speech teacher's point of view which, in the end, allows me to look at how to enrich my approach to the instruction of writing. (Grummett 26)

Sue also experienced a similar professional growth phenomenon in her other sections of the introductory speech course. She helped students make connections not only between classroom speaking and writing and real-life oral and written communication but also between those assignments her students were completing in her speech courses and similar ones assigned to them in their basic freshman composition classes. For example, in explaining the persuasive speech which culminates her semester, she encouraged students to use the same topic, research, and strategies (with obvious adjustments for the oral channel) that they are developing in their writing classes. As she watched and worked with Don, her writing colleague, she also learned more about the speaking-writing tools that she now teaches to all her students so that they can become more sophisticated communicators. For example, the topics that Don regularly talked about, including punctuation to mark sentence boundaries, selecting one of several classic structural patterns to establish focus, applying repetition of key thematic words to maintain that focus, and reading one's writing aloud to hear its voice and rhythm--all are now part of her speaker-writer's toolbox that she shares in her speaking and writing classes.

For Don, who has taught college writing for twenty-two years and speech on and off for twelve, watching students work through Sue's and his linked writing and speaking assignments has dramatically underscored for him that students can learn noticeably more about composing and revising when they "go public" with a performance of their work. The experience of speaking in front of others, he observed, makes students hear their words in

"gut-level" ways that simply reading their words to themselves, either silently or out loud, cannot. This is why broadcast journalists read their stories out loud to someone whenever possible before they open a microphone or go on camera—to discover how others will (or will not) understand their words. Don has learned that what is true for broadcast journalists is also true for his students: Performers will listen to their material with hypersensitive ears when in the presence of a live audience. For students, the experience of publicly performing a piece of writing (or giving an oral presentation that will later be turned in to an essay) has the visceral power to convince them of the absolute need to revise their words for better effect. Therefore, when student oral presenters sense that their audience has become confused or lost because they failed to provide enough examples, or did not supply enough transitions, or packed too much information into a small space, then these presenters truly know what they have to do in order to make things right for their next performance (either written or spoken).

One of our best students emphatically reinforced Don's reflections when she observed that "Combining speaking and writing has been the most efficient, productive, and helpful process in my education." As she further elaborated:

> This class was my first experience with speaking, and in turn the first time I had ever drawn from writing in order to produce a speech. My writing has greatly improved because I've learned to read it out loud to myself. From that process I can tell what sounds awkward, where I need a solid transition and if my ideas are organized well. Since most of our written essays were evolved into speeches, I also picked up on sentences that would

sound good in a speech. Thus my writing was the basis for speaking.

Recalling the concern we had at the conclusion of the first two-year experiment, we view the increased confidence of student public speakers as validation for undertaking this kind of radical curriculum change. For example, David, a strong and prolific writer but a reticent speaker, admitted to the fact that it was the combination of speaking and writing that most influenced his decision to take the class because of his initial discomfort in speaking in front of groups. Although he struggled all year with his oral presentations, his willingness to get feedback on both speaking and writing assignments was "extremely helpful." As he reflected, "By getting critique[s] on both writing and speaking I can combine the ideas generated and apply them to either/or. It really improved my confidence because in order to speak and write on any given topic you must know it that much better." David was not alone in his experience. We noticed the improvement in other students' speeches by the end of the semester as well. Those learners who committed to revising their papers and discussing their ideas in small groups produced superior final oral performances and, ultimately, better semester-end grades.

Furthermore, the additional goal that we had set out for our integrated curriculum--increased insight into interpersonal and group communication--was also reinforced in the course. We had anticipated that by studying speech communication research while at the same time examining, as a class and in small groups, various pieces of literature and by requiring students, individually, to research a topic that interested them, they would all have a greater appreciation of the complexity of human dynamics. Results, though mixed, led us to conclude that we weren't far off the mark. Take, for example,

the following student's acknowledgment that "you probably most always won't have a 'perfect group' to work with in life"; however, finding "ways to deal with people to get them to do their part" is the difference between group problems in high school and now in college. This same young woman found that writing and doing research on relationships helped her to understand people better and that "there are reasons for their behavior." As she noted, "It's not just because they're weird or stupid!" and "instead of always screaming out, 'why?' I can now cope better." For the most part, our students appeared to enjoy studying relational communications: Some found their own personal relationships enriched because of the experience, others discovered that working in groups showed them how the world really works, and a few noted that it reinforced what they already knew. Acknowledging that our year-long communication block is not a panacea for all problems, we particularly appreciated the frankness of the learner who wrote, "By covering relationships this semester I have learned about why characters in plays, short stories, poems . . . do the things they do--but I'm still clueless about reality."

Nevertheless, other faculty and students alike see the year-long communication block as a more realistic move towards adding value to the curriculum, which furthers the UAS goal of increasing student competency in both written and oral communication. One young woman explained it this way:

> I think this combined English and speech course has given us an advantage that we wouldn't have gotten had we taken the classes separately. We learned methods of better writing and speaking, but most importantly how to use them together. It will help us in the future when we have to give a presentation

for a job or something. We've learned how to take a piece of writing and turn it into a powerful speech.

Given the national (as well as our own university's) focus on assessing student communication literacy, and given the pressure that all institutions of higher learning are facing in responding to this call, it is time we seriously consider combining the resources of the English and speech departments. Such a merger may not only simplify the assessment process but also strengthen the case for evaluating learner competencies in all disciplines. Just as we have asked our colleagues in other disciplines--economics, business, sociology, etc.—to participate in writing-across-the-curriculum workshops, to build their understanding of the writing process, to strengthen their writing assignments and evaluations of student papers, and to help students prepare for their mid-degree and final writing portfolios, we are now in a better position to expect the same kind of support for speaking-across-the-curriculum training, activities, and assessment. What better way to accomplish this end than to link speech communication teachers with their peers in jointly developing courses so that students learn discipline content as well as communication skills? For example, at a recent faculty convocation training seminar we benefited from learning about small-group dynamics and incorporating group activities into our classes from another English professor's perspective. A threat to our speech discipline? Hardly! Sue, as the only full-time speech communication faculty member, considers it a coup that faculty from other disciplines are able and willing to share what they know about integrating oral communication pedagogy and theory into their classes.

As a result of teaching speaking and writing (and, to a lesser extent, listening and reading) in one combined class, observing the obvious

similarities between writing and speaking, and helping our students to cross the bridges between the two skill areas, we find that a change in our thinking about teaching communication courses is occurring at our small university. The question "Why aren't speech and writing taught together?" no longer seems as farfetched as it once did. In her master's degree research on this subject, Karleen convincingly argues that "Combining [speech and writing] may be more necessary for our students than we realize."

On the other hand, given the problems of transferring credit both within and outside the University of Alaska system, the authors are not sanguine about changing the curriculum permanently as a result of this successful experiment. However, if a permanent marriage of speaking and writing is not possible, we might consider more seriously Don's comments of a number of years ago:

> In my mind, a paradigm shift is needed here--a shift back to the nineteenth-century Cornell system "where speaking and writing were taught at the same time as interrelated activities" (qtd. in Creek 12). We should seriously consider combining our separate introductory speech and composition courses into a single larger one that interweaves the two subjects. But if combining these courses turns out to be politically impossible, then we can do an end run around this difficulty and simply add more speaking-into-writing activities to our existing composition classes. (Cecil 7)

Ambitious or foolhardy? That remains to be seen. In any case, we need to begin by teaching speech teachers more about writing, and composition teachers more about oral literacy without the fear of losing turf or weakening the integrity of our curriculum. This will require additional professional development for some, team teaching and overloads for others, minimally

linking the two basic courses. Assuredly, it will require leadership from both the Speech Communication and English faculties. Perhaps then we can all express the same enthusiasm for learning and for interdisciplinary efforts as that expressed by the student who gushed in one of his e-mail conference communiqués with fellow classmates:

> I'm going nutzoid without the class. all the talking it <was> wonderful. the discussion, am I exaggerating or was that class >cool<?? am I exaggerating or did that class >talk<?? . . . talking and english should >always< be combined. always. . . . I was a wallflower-extreme before this class. I still am one now but I do sit up and talk from time to time. . . . this class, I repeat, was a wonderful idea and should not have been stopped at this one. . . .

Perhaps if we are more willing to take the risk of crossing what have become "sacred" boundaries, to form new friendships, and to collaborate with our English colleagues, we can all look forward to achieving a better product, one similar to that described by Jamie as "by far the best educational experience" she had ever had. Is there any one of us who does not wish for our students the kind of experience described by this insightful and hardworking young woman?

> In no other class does a student learn so much relevant material on such a vast number of topics. I would encourage any student . . . to experience this for themselves. I will carry the things that I have learned here forever.

Works Cited and Sources Consulted

Adler, Ron, and George Rodman. Understanding Human Communication. Miami: Harcourt Brace College, 1994.

Akinasso, F. Niyi. "On the Differences Between Spoken and Written Language." Language and Speech 25 (1982): 97-125.

_____. "On the Similarities between Spoken and Written Language." Language and Speech 28 (1985): 323-359.

Applebee, Arthur N. Tradition and Reform in the Teaching of English: A History. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1974.

Cecil, Donald. "The Speaking/Writing Connection: Why Haven't Writing Departments Capitalized on It Far More?" Unpublished paper for the Conference on College Composition and Communication. Washington, D. C.: March 1995.

Cecil, Donald, and Kathleen O'Dell. "The Speaking/Writing Connection: It's Far More Powerful Than We Thought." Unpublished paper for the College Reading and Learning Association. Kansas City, MO: 1993.

Creek, Mardena. "'Setting Minds in Motion'": An Interview with James J. Murphy." Writing on the Edge 5.2 (Spring 1994): 9-23.

Elbow, Peter. "The Shifting Relationships between Speech and Writing." College Composition and Communication 36 (1985): 283-303.

Grummett, Karleen. "Reconnecting Speaking and Writing: Reseeing the Possibilities." Unpublished paper for Northeastern University's Institute on Writing and Teaching. Vineyard Haven, MA: July 1996.

Halpern, Jeanne W. "Differences Between Speaking and Writing and Their Implications for Teaching." College Composition and Communication 35 (1984): 345-357.

Hawisher, Gail E., and Paul LeBlanc. Re-Imagining Computers and Composition: Teaching and Research in the Virtual Age. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1992.

Hirsch, E. D., Jr. The Philosophy of Composition. University of Chicago Press, 1977.

Kate, Stephen. The Music of Rhetoric: Toward the Temporal Dimension of Affect in Reader Response and Writing. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University, 1996.

Koester, Susan, Donald Cecil, and Karleen Grummett. "Building Bridges within the General Education Curriculum: Creating a New Speaking and Writing Connection." Unpublished paper for the Speech Communication Association Conference. San Diego, CA, 1996.

Kroll, Barry and Roberta J. Vann, eds. Exploring Speaking-Writing Relationships: Connections and Contrast. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1982.

Leggett, Sarah. "The Relationship between Speaking and Writing: An Annotated Bibliography." College Composition and Communication 35 (1984): 334-344.

Mayher, John S. Uncommon Sense: Theoretical Practice in Language Education. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1990.

McElroy, Davis Dunbar. The Study of Literature. No other information available.

Ochsner, Robert S. Physical Eloquence and the Biology of Writing. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1990.

Ong, Walter J. Interfaces of the Word. Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press, 1977.

Plato. The Phaedrus. New York: Bollingen Foundation, 1961.

Rubin, Donald L., and William M. Dodd. Talking into Writing: Exercises for Basic Writers. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1987.

Solchenberger, Laurie. "Oral and Written Language: The Importance of Speech to Writing." Unpublished paper for Education 423 ("Introduction to Writing Instruction in the Elementary Classroom"), University of Alaska Southeast. Juneau, Alaska: December 4, 1997. (Available through Donald Cecil; see cover page of this paper for address.)

Tannen, Deborah. "Oral and Written Strategies in Spoken and Written Narratives." Language 58 (1982a): 1-21.

_____. "The Orality of Literature and the Literacy of Conversation." In Language, Literacy, and Culture: Issues of Society and Schooling. Ed. Judith A. Langer. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1987.

Zoellner, R. "Talk-Write: A Behavioral Pedagogy for Composition." College English 30 (1969): 267-320.

University of Alaska Southeast

MEMORANDUM

TO: UAS Advising Staff
Bruce, Lori, Pattie, Elizabeth, Greg & Others

FROM: Sue Koester (Speech Communications faculty)
Chris Weaver (English faculty)

RE: This Fall for Entering Freshmen: Our Special Year-long Integrated Sequence of Communication GERs—Linked, Interwoven Sections of Engl 111, Engl 211, and SpC 111

DATE: April 20, 1998

This coming academic year, we will offer a special section of Engl 111 in the fall that is linked to a specific section of Engl 211 offered at the same time in the spring for the purpose of interweaving these courses' assignments and activities with those of SpC 111. This arrangement, detailed below, will allow students who enroll in these specific sections of English 111 and 211 to earn credit simultaneously for SpC 111—and to do so in a much more natural, integrated way, one that should make their learning more meaningful and permanent. Each of these special sections of Engl 111, Engl 211, and SpC 111 will be designated in the course schedules as "Section 1."

Students who enroll in these sections of Engl 111 and 211 will also enroll this fall in a special "on-paper-only" section of SpC 111 that will be scheduled concurrently with English 111/Section 1. (They will both meet TR 9 - 11 a.m.) Instead of meeting for the usual 2.5 clock hours each week, students will meet for an additional 1.5 clock hours a week in Engl 111 in order to do half of the work for SpC 111. At the end of fall, students will receive a letter grade for Engl 111 but a "Deferred" (DF) grade for SpC 111. Then in the spring, after students have completed the other half of their SpC 111 work in Engl 211/Section 1, they will receive a letter grade for SpC 111 upon successful completion of English 211. In other words, students will register for SpC 111 in the fall but do their oral communication work in both their Engl 111 and 211 courses during AY 97-98.

We have room for 25 (or more) students in this linked sequence, which is open to any student who meets the prerequisites for English 111. However, these courses should appeal especially to above-average "honors" students who are interested in experimental, interdisciplinary, team taught/facilitated learning, and not one but two instructors responding to their speaking and writing. Additionally, these above average students are those who are interested in receiving the extra benefits that come from practicing speech communication over an entire year rather than just a semester.

Here is how the nine-credit linked sequence will work:

In the fall, students will register for

> Engl 111/Section 1 and SpC 111/Section 1, both of which will be scheduled concurrently (Tues/Thurs 8:50 - 10:50 a.m.)
>
> Students will receive 4 clock hours of instruction each week — the equivalent of 3 credits of English 111 (2 hrs. 30 min.) and 1.5 credits of SpC 111 (1 hr. 15 min.).
>
> Students will receive a grade for Engl 111, but will receive a "Deferred" (DF) grade for SpC 111, which they will finish in Engl 211/Section 1 during the Spring 1998 semester.

In the spring, students will register for

> Engl 211/Section 1, which will meet during the same time block—Tues/Thurs 9:00 - 11:00 a.m.—during which they will finish their SpC 111 work. At the end of the semester, they will receive credit and a grade for both English 211 and SpC 111.

These courses will be blended so that in most situations it will be nearly impossible for Sue and Chris to give a separate grade for either the speech or written communication assignments.

If students drop out of Engl 211 in the spring, can they still receive credit for SpC 111? Yes, if they remain at UAS and sit in on one of Sue's sections of SpC 111 in the spring and work with her to complete the remaining 1.5 credits.

This linked sequence of courses, which has the support of Robbie Stell, John Pugh, and Art Petersen, will allow us to continue our experimenting with interweaving the naturally related communication fields of speech and writing, something which more and more small colleges around the country are doing and which our university catalog implies that we already do as a result of our assessment of students' skills in the competency area of communication, specifically writing, speaking, reading, and listening. If you have questions, please contact Sue (x 6422, 789-9581, JFSHK) or e-mail Chris(x6403, 780-6569, JFCW).

COMMUNICATION G.E.R. BLOCK:

Engl 111: Freshman Composition,
SpC 111: Fundamentals of Oral Communication
Engl 211: Intermediate Composition with Modes of Literature
Academic Year 1997-98

Fall Semester: Engl 111, Section 1 and SpC 111, Section 1
Tues/Thurs, 8:50 - 10:50 a.m.

COURSE SYLLABUS

Scope of the Course: This interdisciplinary team-taught course is a hybrid of UAS's introductory classes in college composition and oral communication. The instructors will introduce you to the basic principles of communication literacy by placing you in interpersonal, small-group, and public-speaking settings in which you will apply the techniques of organization, development, research, and critical thinking to your reading, writing, speaking, and listening activities.

Students enrolled in this four-hour communication block will receive full credit for Engl 111 at the conclusion of fall semester and full credit for SpC 111 and Engl 211 at the conclusion of spring semester. In other words you will take the first half of SpC 111 fall semester with Engl 111 in the fall and the second half (or 1.5 credits) of SpC 111, in conjunction with Engl 211, in the spring. Your UAS transcript will list these classes as three separate courses; however, you will discover that these courses are combined and integrated into our one-year-long block to better address your overall communication needs.

Required Text and Materials:

Adler, Ron and George Rodman. Understanding Human Communications. Sixth ed. San Diego: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1994.

Escholz, Paul and Alfred Rosa. Outlooks and Insights: A Reader for College Writers. Fourth ed. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.

Hacker, Diana. A Writer's Reference. Fourth edition. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's Press, 1995.

Other readings and handouts will be distributed throughout the year.

Additionally, students are required to purchase a three-ring notebook with subject dividers and an 8 mm videotape (like those used in a standard camcorder). If you do not have access to a dictionary and thesaurus, we strongly recommend that you purchase these supplemental materials.

Instructors:

Karleen Grummett:

Office:	_____
Office Hours:	_____
Phones:	465-6417 (work) with Lisa (secretary) 789-9702 (home)
Fax number:	789-9702 (home)
E-Mail:	University of Alaska e-mail address: JFKAG Internet address: JFKAG@acad1.alaska.edu

Sue Koester:

Office:	Soboleff Building, Room 216
Office Hours:	MW, 12 - 2 p.m.; Fri, 9 - 11 a.m. Other times by appointment.
Phones:	465-6422 (work) (answering machine) 789-0581 (home) (answering machine)
Fax numbers:	789-6819 (home) 465-6406 (work)
E-mail:	University of Alaska e-mail address: JFSHK Internet address: JFSHK@acad1.alaska.edu

Don Cecil:

Office:	Hendrickson Building, Room 214C
Office Hours:	Fri., 9 - noon; 1 - 4 p.m. Learning Center hours: Tu/Th, 1 - 2 p.m. Other times by appointment.
Phones:	465-5387 (work) (answering machine) 463-5282 (home) (answering machine)
Fax number:	465-6406 (work)
E-mail:	University of Alaska e-mail address: JFDMC Internet address: JFDMC@acad1.alaska.edu

Specific Communication Block Goals: By the end of the semester you should be able to:

1. understand basic communication theory as it relates to everyday communication situations: specifically, interpersonal, small group, and public speaking and writing;
2. recognize and use appropriately the different modes and conventions of writing and speaking;
3. use both empathic and critical listening in seeking and offering feedback on your and others' communication, both verbal and nonverbal;
4. discover ways to blend your own ideas and writing and speaking strengths with others through transactional communication;

5. understand the characteristics of successful groups and demonstrate ability as an effective member of a small group;
6. analyze different communication scenarios (through both fiction and nonfiction) and provide constructive options for solving communication problems;
7. engage in research on topics of interest to you and organize that research into formal oral presentations and writing with appropriate documentation for both informative and persuasive messages;
8. present your ideas with improved writing and speaking clarity and confidence for success in other academic courses and the workplace.

General Communication Competencies: In addition to the above specific course goals there are general communication competencies which our university expects students to master by the completion of their degree program and which you will practice in class. They are:

1. demonstrate critical thinking skills through reading, speaking, and writing;
2. communicate for a variety of purposes, audiences, and contexts;
3. use a variety of planning strategies for writing and speaking, which include library and computer research;
4. edit and revise written drafts into polished products;
5. work collaboratively on group projects;
6. use effective listening and response strategies.

Other Course Competencies:

1. **professional behavior** (specific to assigned course work), which includes the ability to:
   a) complete assigned tasks on time;
   b) demonstrate professional work habits;
   c) value community service (and select the course's community service option only if it is appropriate to personal goals);
   d) exercise ethical choices;
   e) assume a leadership role when appropriate.

2. **critical thinking** (the group research paper, analysis paper, and persuasive speech and paper), which includes the ability to:
   a) compare, contrast, and evaluate ideas;
   b) describe, evaluate, and analyze communication behavior;
   c) apply concepts and theories to simulated and real-life situations.

3. **information literacy and computer competency** (specific to assigned course work), which includes the ability to:
   a) use computers to locate, process, and store information;
   b) communicate with instructors and each other via e-mail.

How We Get There: This course is organized around the key principles of oral and written communication. In order to allow for class flexibility, we may not always strictly follow the outline. Our course employs a mini-lecture/discussion/exercise approach with the class often being run as a workshop and laboratory where you can observe your own behavior, see the results of your new behavior, compare, contrast, and check your work with people of different experiences, and incorporate successful new behaviors into your daily life. You will achieve this growth by your participation in dyadic and group exercises and in-class discussions.

Individual Conferences with Your Instructors: You will have one formal mid-semester performance-appraisal conference with one of your instructors and a number of writing conferences with your three instructors. However, if you have anything that you wish to discuss with any of us, we highly recommend that you seek us out at any time. We are available to you throughout the semester and encourage you to visit us during our office hours. It is best to make an appointment in advance.

Tutorial Support: The Learning Center has trained staff who can help you with your writing. Call 465-6348 for information about the Center's hours and for scheduling appointments with tutors. You will be required to receive a Learning Center tutor sign-off on your essay revisions before you resubmit them to us. Another important phone number for you to have, as all papers must be typewritten, is the Computer Lab's: 465-6521.

How You Will Be Graded: We will base our grades on student performance in speaking, writing, reading, and listening. You will have opportunities to revise your essays and quizzes, and, on occasion, to regive a speech. Prior to beginning an assignment, you will receive an assessment rubric so you will fully understand the requirements of the activity. Rather than receive a letter grade for each assignment, you will receive concrete feedback, which ultimately will be translated into a graded portfolio at both mid-semester and the end of the course.

Basically, your final course grade breaks down as follows:

10% -- Quizzes
25% -- Oral Presentations
20% -- Informal Writing Assignments
25% -- Formal Writing Assignments
20% -- Participation, Other

If you have any doubt as to how you are doing in the course at any time, ask us!

Withdrawal Policy: You may withdraw from this class anytime through Friday, November 21. You will be informed of your grade prior to that date in order to make a decision. No academic penalty is associated with a withdrawal from a course.

UAS Communications Department Attendance Policy: "All UAS courses in communications involve activities that cannot be duplicated outside of class. Regular attendance is crucial, both for your own learning and as a courtesy to others who are counting on your participation. If you miss more than one week's worth of classes, your course grade may be lowered. Repeated 'lates' also count as absences."

> In this course, everyone starts with an assumption of an "A" for attendance. However, after **four** absences a student's final semester grade will be lowered. After **eight** absences (four weeks) you will not pass the course and thus we will encourage you to drop it and re-enroll another semester when absences will not pose a problem. **Three "lates"** will be treated as one absence.

This class, along with other sections of Engl 211, will be attending two plays at Perseverance Theater per term. Attendance at these plays is required for the second semester of our communications block and recommended for first semester students who are aspiring to either a "B" or an "A." Curtain time is 7:30 p.m. and performances usually end between 9:30 and 10:00 p.m. A short discussion time with the Perseverance Company members will occur after each performance. The cost of each play is $9, which is a discounted price. You are welcome to bring a guest at this cost as well, if there is room. If attending a play with the class will be a problem for you, please let us know and we will find an alternative date for you to attend. Other plays (Juneau-Douglas Little Theater and Theater in the Rough) as well as public presentations which may arise throughout the semester will be noted by your instructors as additional opportunities for achieving your desired course grade.

Late Assignment Policy: All tests, oral presentations, outlines, and papers must be completed and handed in on the required dates. Your grade will be affected for each class day late. Exceptions can be made only if discussed and approved well in advance of the absence.

See the attached course outline for the due dates for all major assignments. It is your responsibility to stay on top of these deadlines; you cannot expect your college professors to be reminding you about these requirements. However, if we make changes, or if you are genuinely confused about due dates, please ask us for clarification.

QUIZZES

You will demonstrate your understanding and use of oral and written communication theory and skills by taking **three to five quizzes** each, approximately every three weeks or so. These quizzes will consist of **one or two essay questions,** taking the form of in-class fast writes.

FORMAL WRITING ASSIGNMENTS

These writing assignments are required of all students who seek to pass the block with a "C" or better. Assessment rubrics will be provided prior to beginning the activity. You will write four formal out-of-class essays and revise your writing (and in some cases a speech) to increase your competencies and enhance your grade. In addition to having your writing read by all of your instructors, the early drafts of these four revisable essays will be responded by your peers on a variety of feedback forms. On the second draft, you will be given a preliminary evaluation on an instructor-feedback/editing form. You may decide to accept this evaluation as the final one and not revise the essay further. However, if you choose to revise an additional time, this earlier evaluation will have no effect on your final grade; its only purpose is to let you see where your paper stands before you tackle the final draft. All drafts must be TYPED and DOUBLE-SPACED. Using a word processor is highly recommended for ease of revision.

In order to share your writing and to get feedback on it, you will be expected to bring enough copies of each draft for every person in your reader-response group (usually three to five people) and one for the instructors.

Cover Notes: With each revision of a paper you submit you will attach a cover note introducing the piece and explaining the changes the paper has gone through from its initial first rough draft conception to this revised product.

Fall Semester

1. *Collaborative Writing Paper:* With two to five other students you will produce and edit a collaborative 3-5 page paper on what you believe makes for an effective group. The paper will discuss what you've learned about group work from past personal and academic experiences. You will be given class time to work on this project but will be expected to use e-mail to continue this exchange of ideas. This paper may be revised either collectively or individually for later submission in your portfolio. (Engl. 111)

2. *Personal Voice Paper:* For this and the following paper, you will choose one subject for the two papers. In this 2-3 page paper you will explore the topic from a very personal viewpoint. The writing will tend towards informal, subjective, nonacademic writing and may be revised for inclusion in your portfolio. (Engl. 111)

3. *Academic Voice Paper:* Using the same subject as selected for the preceding assignment you will write a more formal, objective, academic 3-5 page paper which includes correctly cited sources. Your informative speech will draw from both the personal and academic voice papers. (Engl 111.)

4. *Controversial Paper:* This 3-5 page paper will focus on an issue of public debate and draw upon information found in newspapers or periodicals that you summarize and about which you then draw your own conclusions and interpretations to argue persuasively one side or the other. Your persuasive speech will draw from this paper. (Engl. 111)

Spring Semester

5 & 6. *Poetry or Short Story or Drama Analysis Paper:* These two separate papers, 3-4 pages in length, require that you examine a poem, short story, and/or play and relate your analysis of themes, characters, dialogue, etc. (your choice) to real-life interactions and problems. You will be expected to include portions of the selected genre to support your conclusions. This paper will directly influence the oral interpretative reading assignment. (Engl. 211)

7. *Speech or Nonfiction Analysis Paper:* This 2-3 page paper will examine either a speech or a piece of nonfiction to explore the time, place, and creator's (writer or speaker) rhetorical strategies in order to uncover the value of the selection for understanding a contemporary interaction and/or problem. This paper will directly influence the special occasion speech. (Engl. 211)

8. *Collaborative Research Paper:* Drawing upon your collaborative group work and individual research on the general topic "what makes for effective long-term relationships," your group will determine the criteria and find research to support you conclusions. The research will be personal (drawn from interviews), literary (drawn from poetry, prose, film, and/or plays) and scholarly (drawn from text, periodicals and journals) and will be used to write a research paper (with properly documented sources) that informs the reader of those skills and concepts your group believes necessary for maintaining long-term relationships. This paper will directly influence the final group presentation. (Engl 211)

INFORMAL WRITING ASSIGNMENTS
for both Engl 111 and 211

In addition to the four revised papers, you will be asked to engage in a variety of informal writing exercises in your communication notebook (see next ¶). You will receive assignment sheets and assessment rubrics that fully explain each task when these assignments are made. All of your written work should be included in your final writing portfolio, just as all of your taped oral presentations will be included on your final video cassette.

Communication Notebook: In a separate notebook (either spiral or loose leaf, though you may print them out on your computer) you will keep notes about topics discussed in class. That would include almost anything that will help you gain fluency in communication: notes taken in class lectures, quotes for inspiring writing, how your writing is going, ideas for speeches and papers, how group work is evolving, responses to reading prompts, brainstorming ideas, class exercises, or reflections about what you are learning about communication. We would expect minimally a page per week (totaling about 4800 words or 16 pages) and will collect them twice during the semester.

ORAL COMMUNICATION ASSIGNMENTS

These speaking assignments are required of all students who seek to pass the block with a "C" or better. Assessment rubrics will be provided in advance of undertaking the assignment.

Fall Semester

1. *Informative Speech:* Based upon your personal and academic-voice papers, you will prepare a 10-15 minute oral presentation that conveys a body of information about a topic you find of interest. You will be expected to use a variety of informative speaking techniques, a visual aid, and note cards. (First semester, SpC 111)

2. *Persuasive Speech:* Based upon your controversial paper, you will prepare a 10-15 minute oral presentation that conveys a body of information about a controversial subject. You will be expected to acknowledge both sides of the issue, but your presentation will focus more specifically on one or the other. Additionally, you will use a visual aid and note cards. (First semester, SpC 111)

3. *Informal Group Forum*: Based upon the collaborative group paper started at the beginning of the semester and the ongoing interaction you are having with your writer/speaker feedback group, your group will make an informal presentation about its findings regarding effective group interaction. (First Semester, SpC 111)

Spring Semester

4. *Oral Interpretation of Literature Speech:* Based upon either one of the two literature analysis papers (poetry, short story or drama) you've written, you will present a 12-15 oral reading consisting of one selection (i.e., cutting from a play) or a number of pieces (i.e., five Emily Dickinson poems) with a formal introduction and conclusion of your own thoughts. (Second Semester, SpC 111)

5. *Special Occasion Speech*: Based upon your speech/nonfiction analysis paper you will present a 12-15 minute special occasion speech either commemorating a person

(i.e., Martin Luther King Jr.) or event (i.e., Whole Earth Day) with a formal introduction and conclusion. (Second Semester, SpC 111)

6. Group Training Presentation: Based upon your collaborative group work and individual research, your group will make a formal presentation of its research and suggestions on the general topic of building effective long-term relationships. This hour long instructional presentation will be interactive, include a variety of literary and scholarship sources and utilize a variety of visual aids to support your group's conclusions about what is necessary to maintain effective long term relationships. (Second Semester, SpC 111)

PARTICIPATION

In order for you to demonstrate and develop active listening skills and constructive criticism/peer feedback competencies, the following activities will allow you to practice listening and offering feedback.

1. Evaluation(s) of Other Students' Speeches: You will provide written justification of your numerical evaluation of your peers' presentations which will be due at various times throughout semester.

2 Evaluation(s) of Other Students' Writing: Throughout the semester, you will provide peer feedback to other students about their writing.

3. Communicating via E-mail: Throughout the semester you will use e-mail in order to demonstrate and develop computer competency and to maintain contact with your instructors and peers for additional comment and reflection upon the speaking/writing assignments.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR A "B" OR AN "A"

In addition to all that has been described above, those who wish to receive either an "A" or a "B" must complete two items from *LIST A* and one from *LIST B* each semester. (During spring semester, the student must choose *different* items from these lists.) Assessment rubrics will be provided for all of these assignments.

LIST A

1. Self-Evaluation Paper: After observing the videotape of your presentation, write a 2-3 page paper explaining how you felt at the conclusion of the speech: what worked, what didn't work, and what do you plan to do differently for future speeches.

2. Reaction Paper: After reading over the feedback you receive from your peers and instructors on either a speech or essay, write a 2-3 page paper discussing what you

learned from their comments, what you would like to have heard from the comments but didn't, and how this feedback influenced your choices/strategies for future communication.

3. *Extended Dialogue:* With one of your instructors or a peer, discuss via e-mail one of your speeches or papers. This 1-3 page dialogue could include ideas about the formation and development about this communication product and any changes and adjustments you plan to make based upon the feedback you receive.

4. *Writing Center Tutor Feedback:* After working with a TLC tutor on two different occasions, write a 2-3 paper reflecting on both the quality of the oral exchange and what you learned about your writing. Compare and contrast the two experiences in your paper.

5. *Play /Public Oratory Reviews:* After watching a dramatic performance or public presentation, write a 2-3 paper evaluating any aspect of the performance that you found provocative: topic, staging, lighting, acting, visual aides, etc.

LIST B

1. *Public Speaking Opportunities:* Examples of this option for communicating in real work/life situations include formal presentations at work or before the CBJ Assembly, School Board, or legislature; and facilitation of a group effort at work, for a community group, or in student government.

2. *Audio-video Assistant:* Learn how to use audiovisual equipment; set up, take down, and return equipment on day of taping; and arrange for substitute on day(s) you will be absent from class.

3. *Impromptu(s):* Topic(s) for these short and spontaneous 2-3 minutes presentations are provided by the instructors or are in response to a controversial-subject speech and are selected the day of the actual impromptu.

4. *Interview with a Speaker/Writer:* You will find someone who uses speaking and writing extensively in his or her life to interview and observe. In a short informal class presentation, you will then share with the class quotes from this person, observations of your own about what and how this person communicates, and what you've learned from her/him that informs your own speaking and writing choices.

5. *Tape-Recorded Paper:* Using high quality recording equipment (available at the Library Media Center), you will read one of your papers aloud followed by a 5-10 minute discussion commenting on this experience and what you learned about your speaking and writing.

FINAL REQUIREMENTS FOR AN "A"

Should you desire an "A," you will need not only to complete the necessary items from each list described above by the end of week 14 each semester but also to write a final portfolio cover letter explaining why you have achieved excellence in both speaking and writing and how it is clearly demonstrated in the final oral/written communication portfolio you submit at the close of the semester.

WRITING /SPEAKING PORTFOLIO REQUIREMENTS

At the end of the semester (**12/18 noon**) you are required to submit a writing/speaking portfolio that contains both your **oral videotape** (no longer than 5 minutes) **and 3000-4000 words** (approximately 20 pages) of your best work (including a reflective cover piece, some type of evaluation of group process, and a minimum of two selections). No more than 50% of your portfolio will consist of collaborative writing. The page count does not include all previous drafts and cover letters, which must be attached to the final draft. One of the written pieces must be a writing that uses other sources by integrating others' ideas and quotes into your writing. The videotape may be of any oral presentation (in or outside of class) and must include an introductory cover letter that briefly describes the context for the presentation, why you selected this five-minute piece, and why it's the best demonstration of your oral communication skills. You will submit a practice portfolio (**1800-2500 words plus reflective cover essay**) the 9th week (**10/24 noon**) of the semester to be evaluated by your peers.

The reflective cover piece that you will produce for both your midterm and end-of-semester portfolios will introduce your portfolio to the instructors and discuss your work and the progress you've made as a writer. To help you prepare your portfolio, we will give you a portfolio checklist and make ourselves available for individual student conferences.

A Word about Plagiarism

The American Heritage Dictionary says that to plagiarize is to take, steal, or use the writings or ideas of another as if they were one's own. If your name is on a paper, then your readers assume the ideas and expressions in it are yours if you have not quoted a source and given credit to it. If you *paraphrase* someone else's idea—i.e., if you put the idea into your own words rather than quote it—you still must give credit to the source of that idea if the idea is new to you. In all colleges and universities, plagiarism is a serious academic offense and is usually rewarded with an "F" in the course. Repeated offenses will most likely result in expulsion from UAS. However, asking someone for advice and help is not plagiarism. All writers can profit from such outside advice, and the faculty encourages you to seek out others to act as editors of your work. But remember that an editor does not write your paper or invent its major ideas. Unless those ideas are yours, you *must* give credit to your sources.

Engl 111/SpC 111 COURSE OUTLINE
Fall 1997

Week 1 **9/2 & 4**	**INTRO TO COURSE, EACH OTHER & TRANSACTIONAL COMMUNICATION** Reading: Adler 1 & 8 Activities:	**Due**
Week 2 **9/9 & 11**	**SMALL GROUP COMMUNICATION** Reading: Adler 9 & 10; Handout on Col. Wrtg Activities:	**Due**
Week 3 **9/16 & 18**	**INTRAPERSONAL COMMUNICATION: PERCEPTION & SELF-CONCEPT** Reading: Chapter 2 Activities:	**Due**
Week 4 **9/23 & 25**	**FINDING OUR PERSONAL VOICE** Reading: Chapter 11 Activities:	**Due** 1st draft, collab. paper
Week 5 **9/30 & 10/2**	**LANGUAGE & NONVERBAL COMM** Reading: Chapter 3 & 5 Activities:	**Due** 1st item from List A

Week 6 **10/7**	**FINDING OUR ACADEMIC VOICE** Reading: Chapter 12, 13, & 14 Activities	**Due** 1st Draft, Personal Voice Paper; Draft, Inform. SpC Outline
Week 7 **10/14 & 16**	**INFORMATIVE SPEECHES** Reading: Chapter 14 Activities:	**Due** 2nd Draft, Coll Paper; Inform. SpC Outline
Week 8 **10/21 & 23**	**INFORMATIVE SPEECHES** Reading: Activities:	**Due** 1st Draft, Academic Voice Paper; **PORTFOLIO**
Week 9 **10/28 & 30**	**PORTFOLIO EVALUATION** Reading: Activities:	**Due** 2nd Draft, Personal Voice Paper
Week 10 **11/4 & 6**	**ISSUES & VALUES** Reading: Chapter 10 Activities:	**Due** 2nd Draft, Academic Voice Paper
Week 11 **11/11 & 13**	**ANALYSIS & ARGUMENTATION** Reading: Chapter 15 Activities:	**Due** 1st Draft, Controv. Paper

Week 12 **11/18 & 20**	**RESEARCH WRITING** Reading: Activities:	**Due** Draft, Pers SpC Outline; 2nd item from List A
Week 13 **11/25**	**PERSUASIVE SPEECHES** Reading: Research Activities:	**Due** Pers SpC Outline; 1st item from List B
Week 14 **12/2 & 4**	**PERSUASIVE SPEECHES** Reading: Research Activities:	**Due** 2nd Draft, Controv. Paper
Week 15 **12/9 & 11**	**SMALL GROUP COMMUNICATION** Reading: Research Activities:	**Due** Draft Sm Grp Forum Outline
Week 16 **12/16 & 18**	**SMALL GROUP FORUMS** Reading:	**Due** Forum Outline **PORTFOLIO**

STUDENT INFORMATION SHEET, Engl/SpC 111, Fall 1997

Full name _____

Home Phone _____Work Phone _____E-mail_____

Name and year of high school graduation or GED _____

Academic major or future career goals _____

Your total credits this semester _____ Total work hours _____

What family/work obligations do you have? _____

_____

What experiences do you have working in groups (advisory boards, clubs, etc.)? _____

What experiences do you have speaking in public (church, class officer, etc.)? _____

List and describe the oral communication classes/workshops you have taken in the past _____

Circle all the writing courses you have completed.

Engl 061 **Engl 105** **Engl 110** **Engl 111** **Engl 211** **Other?**

Rate yourself in the following oral communication skills (circle one):

Meeting strangers	Poor Fair Good Excellent
Managing conflict	Poor Fair Good Excellent
Listening	Poor Fair Good Excellent
Public Speaking	Poor Fair Good Excellent
Working in groups	Poor Fair Good Excellent
Maintaining relationships	Poor Fair Good Excellent

Rate yourself in the following written communication skills (circle one):

Generating Ideas	Poor Fair Good Excellent
Organizing Ideas	Poor Fair Good Excellent
Spelling	Poor Fair Good Excellent
Grammar & Punctuation	Poor Fair Good Excellent
Sentence/paragraph development	Poor Fair Good Excellent
Vocabulary choice	Poor Fair Good Excellent
Support/documentation	Poor Fair Good Excellent

On the back write a short paragraph describing your communication goals for this class.

PREREQUISITE INFORMATION FOR ENGL/SPC 111

NAME: _____ SSN: _____

Completion of English 110 at UAS:

Instructor _____

Semester/Year _____

Grade _____

Portfolio passed the end-of-term reading?

_____Yes _____No

OR

English Placement Test (Learning Center) Data:

Date Taken _____

Writing Sample Score _____/6

Multiple Choice English Score _____/36

Multiple Choice Reading Score _____/24

OR

UAS Counselor/instructor's permission:

_____

name of UAS counselor or instructor

OR

Advanced Placement:

_____

name or type of advanced placement test

_____

location of test site and date (month/year) of test

_____

name of counselor who approved the placement

Engl 211/SpC 111 / Course Outline
Spring 1998

Week 1 **1/13 & 15**	Reading: Activities:	*Richard III.* Adler, chs. 6 & 7 Intro to course, each other, relationships, & literature	
Week 2 **1/20 & 22**	Reading: Activities:	Read Alice Elliott Dark's "In the Gloaming" Watch & discuss M.L. King's "I Have a Dream" speech. Intro. to Special Occasion speech (#2) and paper (#3) assignments	
Week 3 **1/27 & 29**	Reading: Activities:	*Richard III.* Adler, chs. 6 & 7 Watch & discuss "In the Gloaming"	**Due: Quiz**
Week 4 **2/3 & 5**	Reading: Activities:	*Richard III.* Watch & discuss *Richard III* Intro. to Interpretive Oral Reading & papers #1 & #2	**Due: List AA, 1st paper**
Week 5 **2/10 & 12**	Reading: Activities:	Read Suu Kyi's "Freedom from Fear" speech Watch & discuss *Richard III*	**Due: 1st draft, paper #1**
Week 6 **2/17 & 19**	Reading: Activities:	Lyrics from *Rocky Horror Picture Show* Watch & discuss A.S. Suu Kyi's "Freedom from Fear" speech. Intro. to Group Training Presentation & Research Paper assignment (#4)	**Due: 1st draft, paper #3**
Week 7 **2/24 & 26**	Reading: Activities:	"Two Kinds" or "Joy Luck Club" Chris Weaver: Lecture on *Rocky Horror Picture Show*	**Due: 2nd draft, paper #5**
Week 8 **3/3 & 5**	Reading: Activities:	*A Doll's House* Discuss *A Doll's House*	**Due: 1st draft, paper #2; Quiz**

	SPRING BREAK		
	3/10 & 12		
Week 9 **3/17 & 19**	Reading: Activities:	*A Doll's House* Watch & discuss *A Doll's House*	**Due: 2nd draft, paper #3**
Week 10 **3/24 & 26**	Reading: Activities:	Special Occasion speeches; Discuss *A Doll's House*	**Due: 2nd draft, paper #2**
Week 11 **3/31 & 4/2**	Reading: Activities:	Special Occasion speeches	**Due: 1st draft, research paper (paper #4)**
Week 12 **4/7 & 9**	Reading: Activities:		**Due: List AA, 2nd paper; Quiz**
Friday, April 10	**Last Day to Drop a Class**		
Week 13 **4/14 & 16**	Reading: Activities:		**Due:**
Week 14 **4/21 & 23**	Reading: Activities:		**Due: 2nd draft, research paper (paper #4)**
Week 15 **4/28 & 30**	Reading: Activities:	Group presentations	**Due: Final Portfolio May 1 at noon**
Week 16 **5/5 & 7**	Reading: Activities:	Group presentations	**Due:**

NOTE: Oral interpretive readings and List BB speeches are scheduled throughout the semester at your initiative. Don't wait until the last minute!

Would you like to put your paper in ERIC? Please send us a clean, dark copy!

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC

CS509985

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Paper presented at the 1998 NCA Convention (New York City)
Reversing a Century's Damage: Undoing Harvard's Legacy of Separate Courses for Freshman Speaking & Writing

Author(s): * Donald Cecil & Susan H. Koester

Corporate Source:

Publication Date: November 20-24, 1998

* One author's signature is sufficient.

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 1	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1 ☑	Level 2A ☐	Level 2B ☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature:	Printed Name/Position/Title:
Organization/Address: UAS University of Alaska Southeast, 11120 Glacier Highway, Juneau, AK 99801	Telephone: 907-465-6422 FAX:
	E-Mail Address: donald.cecil@uas.alaska.edu Date:

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

Unsolicited

ERIC/REC
2805 E. Tenth Street
Smith Research Center, 150
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47408

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

~~ERIC Processing and Reference Facility~~
~~1100 West Street, 2nd Floor~~
~~Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598~~

~~Telephone: 301-497-4080~~
~~Toll Free: 800-799-3742~~
~~FAX: 301-953-0263~~
~~e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov~~
~~WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com~~